

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 18-27, 34, 35, 38-43, 46 and 47 are all the claims currently pending in the application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41 and 46 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Thus, entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

**II. Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,522, hereafter Peterson). Claims 2-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kojima et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0078862). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson and Kojima and further in view of the article entitled "ResQ!Net.com Gives 5250 A Complete Makeover," by McKendrick (hereafter McKendrick). Claims 14, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,311,437, hereafter Leal) in view of Peterson. Claims 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal and Peterson and further in view of Sebastian (U.S. Pat. No. 5,552,995, hereafter Sebastian). Claims 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson. Claims 22-24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Kojima and further in view of McKendrick. Claims 34, 38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal in view of Peterson. Claims 37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal and Peterson and further in view of

Sebastian. Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson. Claims 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson and further in view of Kojima. Finally, claims 46-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leal and Peterson and further in view of Sebastian. The Applicants traverse the above rejections for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Peterson and Leal as the main references in combination with Kojima, McKendrick and Sebastian to teach or suggest all the features recited in the independent claims of the present invention. To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41 and 46 to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

The present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41 and 46 is directed to a system, a method and a computer-readable medium implemented so that price information based on purchases at a plurality of bases is made available for display. The purchase price information reflects consumer purchases of objects and materials made at different bases (i.e., offices), which may vary depending on the states or countries where the bases are located. To this end, the information displayed is related to prices paid for *past purchases* made at the different bases. "Prices" in the present invention means "respective object prices at a plurality of bases of a certain object in a case where the certain object is purchased at the plurality of bases from each supplier corresponding to the plurality of bases."

In other words, in a case where a certain object is purchased, it could have happened that the prices are different by purchasing the object from a plurality of bases or suppliers. Therefore, in the present invention, this difference is prices paid for a certain object is

taken into consideration. It does not appear that the cited prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

Peterson is directed to an electronic information network for inventory control and transfer process for distributing items, especially industrial maintenance repair and operating parts and supplies. The process includes two general types of inventory networks i.e. Manufacturer Inventory Network and Distributor Inventory Network. At least one of the networks is capable of displaying, in part, the vendors and manufacturers, parts for sale, and the part prices (see col. 15, lines 49-57).

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that the vendors in Peterson could be businesses that purchased items at a plurality of bases from corresponding supplier, thus the displayed items reflect purchased items. We wholly disagree. Although it may be possible that the items displayed in Peterson have been previously purchased, the prices displayed do not relate to those previous purchase prices. Instead, the listed prices indicate only the cost of presently purchasing the parts from the different vendors or manufacturers. In other words, Peterson discloses that the "owner (vendor or manufacture)" and "the price of the item" are displayed (see column 15, lines 51-55). On the other hand, the present invention displays the person that made a past purchase, the party (or base) from which the purchase was made and the price paid. Accordingly, the present invention is different from Peterson not only in the name of the stored information but also in the meaning and the amount of information received. (i.e., which person, which base and price paid).

Leal is directed to a computer-implemented material selector tool for selecting materials for use in minimizing hazardous waste while producing technically acceptable products. The tool includes a data storage medium that stores information related to physical

characteristics, material operating procedures and hazard/environmental assessments. Nothing in Leal teaches or suggest purchasing of items, let alone displaying of price information related to items purchased at a plurality of bases. In fact, Leal suggest that its teaching are not concerned with business practices related to inventory control of items or the like (see col. 1, lines 58-61). Thus, price comparisons and purchasing of items would not appear to be an obvious use of the computer-implemented material selector tool in Leal. To that end, Leal neither teaches all the aspects of the present invention nor is there adequate motivation in its teachings for combining with other cited prior art (i.e., Peterson) to arrive at the present invention.

Finally, it does not appear that Kojima, McKendrick or Sebastian overcome the deficiencies noted above in Peterson and Leal to render obvious any of the claims of the present invention. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Peterson, Leal, Kojima, McKendrick and Sebastian, the combination still would not teach or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 14. 21, 34, 41 and 46. In particular, "the displaying of price information for objects purchased at a plurality of bases."

Accordingly, claims 1-7, 14-15, 18-27, 34-35, 38-43 and 46-47 are believed to be distinguishable over Peterson, Leal, Kojima, McKendrick and Sebastian, Individually or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4685.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4685.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 08/24/05 By: Mark D. Pratt

Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101